

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,389,464 to Krishnamurthy, et al. ("Krishnamurthy").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Krishnamurthy. Applicants submit that claims 39-40, 50-53, and 63-66 are not anticipated by Krishnamurthy. In regard to the rejection of claim 39, the Examiner has stated in part that:

"Krishnamurthy et al show: an SNMP agent with direct access to configuration data (column 4, lines 44-54), a combined HTTP and SNMP manager only accessing configuration data by communicating with the SNMP agent (column 9 lines 1-24, column 50 lines 16-36), a combined text interface generator and HTTP client only accessing configuration data by requesting the combined HTTP server and SNMP manager to communicate with the SNMP agent (column 11 lines 45-56, column 50 lines 30-45) so that all safety mechanisms are built into the agent for security (column 9 lines 1-10). (11/8/02, Office Action, p. 3)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 39 is not anticipated by Krishnamurthy. Claim 39 recites the feature of **"a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager"** (Emphasis added) Krishnamurthy does not disclose this feature as can be seen by the following analysis of Krishnamurthy. Krishnamurthy discloses a device management system and a universal site server that can be configured from remote locations using Internet browser technology. (Krishnamurthy, title & abstract) The universal site server can operate as a gateway to connect to devices such as PBXs, UPSs, video cameras, switches, and multiplexers. (Krishnamurthy, col. 5, l. 66- col. 6, l. 21 and Fig. 2). The configuration and management of the site server and devices is performed remotely with web manager 18, a remote web browser 58, and/or SNMP manager 20. (Krishnamurthy, col. 6, ll. 22-27, and Fig. 2) Krishnamurthy's site server is functionally illustrated in his Figure 3, which shows an SNMP agent 82, a web server 64, a fax

server 78, MIB 72, and various I/O interfaces. (Krishnamurthy, col. 6, l. 28 – col. 7, l. 65)

Krishnamurthy does not disclose “a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” as claimed in applicants claim 39. In fact, the only SNMP manager described by Krishnamurthy is SNMP manager 20, which sits isolated on NMC LAN 24. (Krishnamurthy, Fig. 2)

Because Krishnamurthy does not disclose “a combined hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” as taught by claim 39, from which claim 40 depends, applicants respectfully submit that claims 39 and 40 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Krishnamurthy.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 39. Claim 50 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 39, and recites “means for **combining** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager”. (Emphasis added) Because, Krishnamurthy does not disclose this feature as taught by applicants’ claim 50 from which claims 51-53 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 39, applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-53 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Krishnamurthy.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for the reason set forth in the rejection of claim 39. Claim 63 discloses substantially similar limitations as claim 39, and recites “**combining** hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) server and SNMP manager” (Emphasis added) Because, Krishnamurthy does not disclose this feature as taught by applicants’ claim 63 from which claims 64-66 depend, for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 39, applicants respectfully submit that claims 63-66 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Krishnamurthy.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 10, 2003

Sanjeet K. Dutta
Sanjeet K. Dutta
Reg. No. 46,145

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Technology Center 2100

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on

March 10, 2003

Date of Deposit

Geneva Walls

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

March 10, 2003

Date

Sanjeet K. Dutta
Signature